

**DOCKET NUMBER 32-6**

L. Scott Keehn (61691)  
Charles F. Robbins (132666)  
Sarah H. Lanham (213555)  
**ROBBINS & KEEHN, APC**  
A Professional Corporation  
530 "B" Street, Suite 2400  
San Diego, California 92101  
Telephone: (619) 232-1700

Attorneys for Petitioning Creditor  
**ALAN STANLY**

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

In Re:  
FRANCIS J. LOPEZ, an individual,  
Alleged Debtor.  
  
Case No. 05-05926-PBINV  
Involuntary Chapter 7  
**EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO  
DECLARATION OF FRANCIS J. LOPEZ  
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION BY ALLEGED  
DEBTOR FOR AN ORDER BIFURCATING  
TRIAL RE INVOLUNTARY PETITION;  
SETTING DEADLINE TO ADD NEW  
PETITION CREDITORS; AND  
REQUIRING THE POSTING OF A BOND**  
  
Date: December 19, 2005  
Time: 10:30 a.m.  
Judge: Hon. Peter W. Bowie  
Dept.: Four (4)

**TO: HONORABLE PETER W. BOWIE, UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY**

**JUDGE:**

Petitioning creditor Alan Stanly ("Stanly") respectfully submits the following evidentiary objections and hereby moves to strike portions of the Declaration of Francis J. Lopez in Support of Motion by Alleged Debtor for an Order Bifurcating Trial Re Involuntary Petition; Setting Deadline to Add New Petitioning Creditors; and Requiring the Posting of a Bond (the "Lopez Declaration"):

**REQUEST FOR RULING ON OBJECTIONS AND MOTION TO STRIKE**

Stanly respectfully requests that this Court issue rulings on the following evidentiary objections and motion to strike prior to ruling on the merits of the Motion by Alleged Debtor for an Order Bifurcating Trial Re Involuntary Petition; Setting Deadline to Add New Petitioning Creditors; and Requiring the Posting of a Bond (the “Motion”).

**EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS****OBJECTION NO. 1.**

**Testimony:** Page 9, paragraph 5, lines 1 through 4 of the Lopez Declaration which state as follows:

My 22 creditors are not contingent, or subject of a bona fide dispute (except Mr. Stanly whose judgment is being appealed). None of the 22 are employees or insiders. None of these creditors received a payment which was outside of the ordinary course of business.

Debtor objects to and moves to strike the above testimony in its entirety based on the following grounds:

**Objection No. 1.1: Improper Legal Conclusion**

Lopez’ testimony, particularly his claim that “None of these creditors received a payment which was outside of the ordinary course of business,” consists of legal conclusions, and Lopez has not presented any evidence to demonstrate that he is qualified to make such conclusions.<sup>1</sup> The “ordinary course” standard of 11 U.S.C. section 547(c)(2) is highly technical and Lopez’ casual use of the term should not be permitted to encompass such a complex legal conclusion.

Further, Lopez has not offered any basis to support the legal conclusions that his alleged creditors’ claims are “not contingent,” not “subject to a bona fide dispute,” and that the alleged creditors are not “employees” or “insiders” as those terms are used in 11 U.S.C. section 303(b). Even if Lopez is not testifying as an expert with regard to these particular assertions, he has

///

///

27

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal Rule of Evidence (“FRE”) 702; See Objection No.1.2, below.

1 presented no evidence to demonstrate the appropriate foundation for the legal conclusions asserted  
 2 in his statements.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, these statements are improper and inadmissible.

3 **Objection No. 1.2: Improper Expert Opinion**

4 Lopez has not been offered as an expert in this case and no evidence has been presented  
 5 concerning whether he has any knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education concerning the  
 6 practice of law to allow him to testify as a legal expert, as required by FRE 702:

7 If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the  
 8 trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in  
 9 issue, *a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill,*  
*experience, training, or education, may testify thereto in the form of*  
 10 *an opinion or otherwise, if (1) the testimony is based upon sufficient*  
 11 *facts or data, (2) the testimony is the product of reliable principles*  
 12 *and methods, and (3) the witness has applied the principles and*  
 13 *methods reliably to the facts of the case. (Emphasis added.)*

14 Because Lopez has not qualified as an expert legal witness, he may not testify concerning legal  
 15 conclusions and the above testimony should be stricken.

16 **Objection No. 1.3: Improper Lay Opinion**

17 No evidence has been presented to qualify Lopez as legal expert and his opinions  
 18 concerning complex legal conclusions are not reasonably based on his perception to qualify as  
 19 admissible lay opinion, as required by FRE 701:

20 If the witness is not testifying as an expert, the witness' testimony in  
 21 the form of opinions or inferences is limited to those opinions or  
 22 inferences which are (a) rationally based on the perception of the  
 23 witness, (b) helpful to a clear understanding of the witness'  
 24 testimony or the determination of a fact in issue, and (c) not based  
 25 on scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge within the  
 26 scope of Rule 702.<sup>3</sup>

27       ///

28       ///

29       ///

30       ///

---

2       FRE Rule 701; See Objection No.1.3, below.

3       FRE 701.

1 As discussed above, Lopez' statements concern complex legal issues which require "scientific,  
2 technical, or other specialized knowledge." Lopez' statements do not qualify as lay opinion and  
3 must be stricken.

4

5 Dated: December 5, 2005

**ROBBINS & KEEHN**  
A Professional Corporation

6

7

8

By: //s// Sarah H. Lanham

L. Scott Keehn

Charles F. Robbins

Sarah H. Lanham

Attorneys for Petitioning Creditor Alan Stanly

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28